

EXHIBIT A

[Excerpts of a February 7, 2019 letter from Eric
Vandavelde to Zachary Hill]

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

333 South Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197
Tel 213.229.7000
www.gibsondunn.com

Eric D. Vandeveld
Direct: +1 213.229.7186
EVandeveld@gibsondunn.com

February 7, 2019

VIA EMAIL

Zachary Hill, Esq.
Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP
One Market, Spear Street Tower
San Francisco, CA 94105-1596

Re: Oracle USA, Inc., et al. v. Rimini Street, Inc. and Seth Ravin
Case No. 2:10-cv-00106-LRH-VCF (D. Nev.)

Dear Mr. Hill:

We write in response to your January 31, 2019 letter regarding the Court's injunction in *Rimini I*.

First, as discussed in our January 23, 2019 letter, and further below, while Rimini does not agree with Oracle's overbroad and unsupported interpretation of the injunction, and further believes that the injunction is vague, unlawful, and otherwise legally defective, Rimini believes that it is in compliance with the terms of the injunction insofar as they are comprehensible and within the scope of the judgment in *Rimini I*. Also, as noted in our January 23 letter, Rimini has been complying, and will continue to comply, with its obligation to preserve documents and other materials related to its support for the Oracle products at issue in the ongoing litigation.

Second, you have not responded to our request that Oracle state the basis for its "concern" that Rimini is not in compliance with the injunction, and we renew our request that Oracle first explain the basis for its concern by reference to post-injunction conduct. We propose that the parties thereafter meet and confer to address any such concern.

Third, your letter confirms that Oracle believes that the *Rimini I* injunction covers conduct that indisputably was not litigated in *Rimini I*. This is contrary to multiple representations that Oracle has made to the district court and the Ninth Circuit, including Oracle's unequivocal representation to Judge Hicks in its renewed motion for a permanent injunction that "Oracle is not asking" for any adjudication of "the issues in dispute in *Rimini II*," and that Oracle is asking only "for a permanent injunction restraining Rimini from continuing to commit the infringement that this Court and the jury have already determined to constitute copyright